



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/025,268	12/18/2001	Roy Want	42390P12018	5674

8791 7590 04/07/2006

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

SAXENA, AKASH

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2128

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/025,268	Applicant(s) WANT ET AL.	
	Examiner Akash Saxena	Art Unit 2128	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-38 have been presented for examination based on the application filed on 18th December 2001.
2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12th January 2006 has been entered.

Response to Applicant's Remarks

3. Applicant's remarks relating to the rejections under 35 USC 102 are considered and examiner withdraws the rejection under 35 USC 102 in view of the amendments and contends that new limitations are not completely taught by Banerjee. New rejections under 35 USC 103 are given below.
4. No arguments were presented against 35 USC 103 themselves, besides being rejected based on 35 USC 102 withdrawn above. Please see new 35 USC 103 rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112¶1st

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for “wireless communication module to communicate with an access device”, does not reasonably provide enablement for “wireless communication module to communicate with plurality of remote electronic devices” simultaneously as understood by use of “and” between the enabling and non-enabling limitations above. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to *make and use* the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Specification does not also state the claimed limitation, except in claims, where the communication between the portable electronic device and access device is disclosed. Specification Pg.5 ¶2 states:

The portable electronic device 14 includes an operating system 37, a mass storage module 38, e.g., a hard disc drive, and a wireless communication module 40 which includes a Bluetooth stack 42 and Bluetooth hardware 44. The wireless communication module 40 and the wireless communication interface 30 communicate with each other using standard Bluetooth IEEE 802.15 communication protocols when within a limited wireless communication range. Typically universal plug and play (UPA) technology is used so that, when the portable electronic device 14 is within the wireless communication range of an access device 12, communications can be established so that the portable electronic device 14 may emulate the electronic apparatus on any one of the plurality of different access devices 12 at different physical locations. Thus, a person or bearer of the portable electronic device 14 may use any access device 12, which is at a location proximate to the user.

Claims 12, 20 and 29 are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-11, 13-19, 21-28 and 30 –38 are rejected based on their dependency on claims 1, 12, 20 and 29.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112nd

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-38 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding Claim 1

Claim 1 discloses “remote electronic device” which has is no support in the specification and examiner is not able to determine how it is different from the access device. For claim interpretation as best understood “remote electronic device” are equivalent various emulated devices like digital clock etc.

Claim 1 discloses “a (sic) apparatus” in preamble and then discloses “portable electronic device” in body. It is unclear if the “wireless communication module” is a part of the “portable electronic device” or a separate entity.

Also besides enablement issue, the purpose of controller communicating with the “remote electronic device” when all the functionality of the “remote electronic device” is emulated by the “portable electronic device” is unclear.

Regarding Claim 2-38

Claims 12, 20 and 29 are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-11, 13-19, 21-28 and 30 –38 are rejected based on their dependency on claims 1, 12, 20 and 29.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

1. Claims 1, 5, 12, 16-17, 20, 24-25, 29, 33-34 and 37 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,292,181 issued to Biswa R. Banerjee et al (Banerjee hereafter), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,292,186 issued to Lehman et al (Lehman hereafter).

Regarding Claim 1

Banerjee teaches an apparatus with a wireless communication module as XMIT/RCVR module (*Banerjee*: Figure 1a, Element 114), to communicate with an access device (*Banerjee*: Figure 1a, Element 101), and a plurality of remote electronic devices as communication between mobile devices (e.g. PDA, PocketPC, smart phones etc) of which wireless communication module is understood to be a part of, is known to a skilled artisan. Further examiner takes Official Notice¹ regarding communication module communicating with remote electronic devices as understood as mobile device to mobile device communication each having a wireless communication module.

Banerjee teaches data storage module to store emulation data used by a portable electronic device to emulate the electronic devices as a memory element (*Banerjee*: Figure 1a, Element 111; Col. 11, Lines 15-23).

Banerjee does not teach storing emulation data for plurality of remote electronic devices.

Lehman teaches a data storage module to store emulation data used by a portable electronic device to emulate the plurality of remote electronic devices (such as TV remote, Garage Door opener, GUI application tailored for users with physical

Art Unit: 2128

impediment) (Lehman: Col.1 Lines 42-67Col.4 Lines 66-Col.5 Line 7; Col.3 Lines 12-15; Col.3 Line 64-Col.4 Line 2).

Lehman teaches *a switch to select a remote electronic device from the plurality of remote electronic devices for the portable electronic device to emulate as a plural graphical user interface (GUI) instantiations* (Lehman: Col.3 Lines 50-58). Further, *a skilled artisan in the art of mobile computing knows various GUI means for switching to select between emulated applications*. Shown below are various applications such as calculator, electronic address book, digital clock etc, as evidentiary support is application interface from Palm Pilot Handbook 1997². Lehman teaches such application design for PDA like Palm Pilot (Lehman: Col.3 Lines 40-49) as well as windows CE (Col.1 Lines 35-37).



Banerjee teaches a controller to control the communication of the emulation data to the access device (Banerjee: Figure 1b, Element 114b; Fig.3a – input displayed in Pen window 310 on the access device/host). Communication to selected remote electronic device is obvious as the selected remote electronic device is emulated on

¹ The Design of PDA Application Schemes for Wireless Communication Services; Ay-Hwa Andy Liou et

the portable electronic device and the controller is on the portable electronic device.

Further a controller, like a processor, in the portable electronic device, like a PDA, is obvious (Lehman: Col.4 Lines 10-65).

Banerjee '181 does not teach completely emulating the selected remote electronic device as claimed.

Lehman specifically teaches emulating the selected remote electronic device wherein the emulation comprises the portable electronic device possessing functionality of the selected remote electronic device (Lehman: Col.4 Lines 10-14; Col.2 Lines 24-63).

It would have been obvious to one (e.g. a designer) of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teachings of Lehman to Banerjee. The motivation to combine would have been that Banerjee's portable electronic device (100) lacks the capability to fully emulate the functionality of the selected remote electronic device (stylus apparatus as disclosed) and leverages the resources of host computer (101), where as Lehman's portable electronic device (or UIA) performs complete emulation onboard and even has modification capabilities to modify the looks and functionality of emulated remote electronic device (e.g. remote) thereby offloading the processing burden from the host computer which is addressed as the drawback in Banerjee '181 (Banerjee: Col11 Lines 24-45 – propagation delay & processing time between the portable electronic device (100) and host computer (101)).

Art Unit: 2128

Regarding Claim 5

Banerjee '181 teaches a wireless communication module to communicate over limited range by access points in a packetized peer-to-peer networking technique using radio frequency (Banerjee '181: Col.6, Lines 51-53, 56-68).

Regarding Claim 6

Banerjee & Lehman's teachings are disclosed in the claim 1 above. Banerjee teaches that communication happens using wireless protocol but is silent on the teachings if the protocol used is Bluetooth IEEE 802.15 or IEEE 802.11b. Lehman teaches Bluetooth communication protocol (Col.5 Lines 1-7).

Regarding Claim 12

System claim 12 is directed towards the similar limitations as the claim 1 and is rejected for the same reason as claim 1. Further Banerjee indicates that devices have indicators indicating then they are in range to communicate (Banerjee '181: Col. 11, Lines 35-38). Lehman also teaches using Bluetooth for wireless communication, which has a limited range (Lehman: Col.5 Lines 1-7).

Regarding Claim 16

Claim 16 is directed towards the same limitations as the claim 5 and is rejected for the same reason as claim 5.

Regarding Claims 17, 25 and 34

Claims 17, 25 and 34 are directed towards the same limitations as the claim 6 and are rejected for the same reason as claim 6.

Art Unit: 2128

Regarding Claim 20

Method claim 20 is directed towards the same limitations as the claim 1 and is rejected for the same reason as claim 1.

Regarding Claim 24

Claim 24 is directed towards the same limitations as the claim 5 and is rejected for the same reason as claim 5.

Regarding Claim 29

Claim 29 is directed towards the same limitations as the claim 1 and is rejected for the same reason as claim 1.

Regarding Claims 33 & 37

Claims 33 & 27 are directed towards the same limitations as the claim 5 and are rejected for the same reason as claim 5.

- 6. Claims 2-4, 13-15, 21-23 and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,292,181 issued to Biswa R. Banerjee et al (Banerjee hereafter), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,292,186 issued to Lehman et al (Lehman hereafter), further in view of web article on "Remote Display Control for Pocket PC" Dated 03-May 2001 (CERDisp hereafter)**

Regarding Claim 2

Teachings of Lehman and Banerjee are disclosed above. Lehman teaches data storage module stores display data (Lehman: Col.2 Lines 23-8, 49-55; Col.5 Lines 1-7, 48-59 graphical user interface – GUI elements etc) to display the GUI controls of the selected remote electronic device e.g. Buttons of TV remote. Banerjee teaches display window for displaying the GUI information (Banerjee: Fig.3a PEN Windows 310) received from the portable electronic device (Banerjee: Fig.3a).

Banerjee and Lehman do not teach the portable electronic device being configured to communicate the display data to the access device to provide a display layout that simulates the physical appearance of the selected remote electronic device.

CERDisp teaches a software called "Remote Display Control" (1997-2001) to provide the display actions of a portable electronic device on a desktop (access device) (Text). Hence, GUI controls or displayed layout that simulates the physical appearance of the selected remote electronic device on the screen of portable access device will also be visible on the access device.

Motivation to combine Banerjee with Lehman is provided in the claim 1 rejection above.

It would have been obvious to one (e.g. a designer) of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teachings of CERDisp to Banerjee-Lehman because CERDisp teaches a “great tool for demonstrating the power of portable electronic device to a larger audience” (on a bigger screen – like in a conference) and “allows the developers to test their applications for a portable electronic device on a larger screen” (like the one provided by the access device). One of the exemplary applications provided by Lehman is tailored for users with physical impediment (Lehman: Col.1 Lines 59-67). Providing a bigger display of portable electronic device simulating the remote electronic device available on the access device (host computer) can be beneficial to such users.

Regarding Claim 3

Lehman teaches controller causes the portable electronic device to simultaneously emulate multiple remote electronic devices from the plurality of remote electronic device (Lehman: Col.1 Lines 42-67Col.4 Lines 66-Col.5 Line 7; Col.3 Lines 12-15; Col.3 Line 64-Col.4 Line 2).

Regarding Claim 4

Lehman teaches wherein the display layout includes function buttons that resemble function buttons on the selected remote electronic device in appearance and which, when activated by a pointing device, cause the portable electronic device to execute similar functions to the function buttons on the selected remote electronic device (Lehman: Col.2 Lines 49-Col.3 Lines-16).

Art Unit: 2128

Regarding Claims 13, 21 and 30

Claims 13, 21 and 30 are directed towards the same limitations as the claim 2 and are rejected for the same reason as claim 2.

Regarding Claims 14, 22 and 31

Claims 14, 22 and 31 are directed towards the same limitations as the claim 3 and are rejected for the same reason as claim 3.

Regarding Claims 15, 23 and 32

Claims 15, 23 and 32 are directed towards the same limitations as the claim 4 and are rejected for the same reason as claim 4.

Art Unit: 2128

- 7. Claims 11, 28 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,292,181 issued to Biswa R. Banerjee et al (Banerjee hereafter), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,292,186 issued to Lehman et al (Lehman hereafter), further in view of U.S. Application No. 20020078161 filed by Doreen Yining Cheng (Cheng hereafter).**

Regarding Claims 11

Banerjee & Lehman's teachings are disclosed in the claim 1 above. Banerjee teaches that communication happens using wireless protocol but is silent on the teachings if the protocol used is Bluetooth IEEE 802.15 or IEEE 802.11b. Lehman teaches Bluetooth communication protocol (Col.5 Lines 1-7).

Further, Banerjee & Lehman does not also disclose if the communication is happening using Universal-Plug-and-Play (UPnP) standards.

Cheng teaches that multiple standards like Bluetooth IEEE 802.15, USB, Home RF which are not IP enabled can be used to wirelessly communicate with using UPnP standards with the use of disclosed UPnP device (Cheng: [0018]).

Motivation to combine Banerjee with Lehman is provided in the claim 1 rejection above.

It would have been obvious to one (e.g. a designer) of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of Cheng to combine with the teachings of Banerjee and Lehman because Cheng teaches communication between non UPnP devices (E.g. portable device) and UPnP devices (E.g. PC) possible using Bluetooth (Cheng: Figure 1; Lehman: teaching Bluetooth) thereby making them more compatible to transfer information.

Art Unit: 2128

Regarding Claims 28 and 38

Claims 28 and 38 are directed towards the same limitations as the claim 11 and are rejected for the same reason as claim 11.

Art Unit: 2128

- 8. Claims 7, 8, 9, 18, 19, 26 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,292,181 issued to Biswa R. Banerjee et al (Banerjee hereafter), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,292,186 issued to Lehman et al (Lehman hereafter), further in view of “winamp.com, Winamp 2.05, Nov 15, 1998” retrieved from <http://web.archive.org> for site <http://www.winamp.com> on march 31, 2005 (Winamp 2.05 hereafter).**

Regarding Claim 7

Teachings of Banerjee and Lehman are disclosed in claim 1. Banerjee and Lehman do not teach access device to have a multimedia interface with access device getting emulation data from portable device.

Winamp 2.05 teaches that Winamp is multimedia interface (Winamp 2.05: Comment 1) that can receive emulation data like skins (Winamp 2.05: Comment 3) from another device.

Motivation to combine Banerjee with Lehman is provided in the claim 1 rejection above.

It would have been obvious to one (e.g. a designer) of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of Winamp 2.05 and use them with Banerjee and Lehman teachings of sending information from portable device to access device. The motivation would be that Winamp 2.05 could accept skins and music from various sources by downloading it (Winamp 2.05: Comment 3).

Regarding Claim 8

Teachings of Banerjee and Winamp 2.05 are disclosed above in claim 7. Winamp 2.05 defines the user interface (Winamp 2.05: Comment 3). Further, Winamp 2.05

Art Unit: 2128

teaches that it can receive audio data (MIDI) by HTTP streaming (Winamp 2.05: Comment 2).

Regarding Claim 9

Teachings of Banerjee and Winamp 2.05 are disclosed above in claims 7 & 8.

Winamp 2.05 along with Banerjee teaches that portable machine could emulate the functionality of MP3 player as Winamp can run on windows based systems (Winamp 2.05: Comment 5). Lehman teaches a portable electronic machine like Palm Pilot from 3Com (release 1997), which is known in the art to have features like a calculator and PDA (Lehman: Col.3 Lines 40-49).

Regarding Claim 18

Claim 18 is directed towards the same limitations as the claim 9 and is rejected for the same reason as claim 9.

Regarding Claim 19

Claim 19 is directed towards the same limitations as the claim 8 and is rejected for the same reason as claim 8. Downloading skins on a Winamp is considered as downloading text and numeric data.

Regarding Claim 26

Claim 26 is directed towards the same limitations as the claim 7 and is rejected for the same reason as claim 7.

Regarding Claim 35

Claim 35 is directed towards the same limitations as the claim 9 and is rejected for the same reason as claim 9.

9. **Claims 10, 27 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6292181 issued to Biswa R. Banerjee et al (Banerjee hereafter), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,292,186 issued to Lehman et al (Lehman hereafter), further in view of “winamp.com, Winamp 2.05, Nov 15, 1998” retrieved from <http://web.archive.org> for site <http://www.winamp.com> on march 31, 2005 (Winamp 2.05 hereafter), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,233,611 issued to Harold Aaron Ludtke et al (Ludtke hereafter).**

Regarding Claim 10

Teachings of Banerjee '181 and Winamp 2.05 are disclosed above in claim 7.

Banerjee '181 does not teach the assessing capabilities of the access device before communicating.

Ludtke '611 teaches a creating a device profile relating to capabilities and requirements of device and ascertains that resources are available to handle the multimedia requirements (Ludtke '611: Abstract Lines 4-9, 15-19, Figure 5 & 6).

Motivation to combine Banerjee with Lehman is provided in the claim 1 rejection above.

Motivation to combine Banerjee with Winamp 2.05 is provided in the claim 7 rejection above.

It would have been obvious to one (e.g. a designer) of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of Ludtke and apply them to Banerjee to access the capabilities of the destination before transmitting the data. The motivation to combine would be that Ludtke '611 teaches basis how to create destination profiles and compare their availability them before transmitting data,

Art Unit: 2128

especially multimedia data for devices coupled in a network (Ludtke '611: Abstract Lines 1-3).

Regarding Claims 27 and 36

Claims 27 and 36 are directed towards the same limitations as the claim 10 and are rejected for the same reason as claim 10.

Conclusion

10. All claims are rejected.

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

12. **Examiner's Note:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in their entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Akash Saxena whose telephone number is (571) 272-8351. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 - 6:00 PM M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kamini S. Shah can be reached on (571)272-2279. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Akash Saxena
Patent Examiner, GAU 2128
(571) 272-8351
Monday, April 03, 2006



Kamini S. Shah
Supervisory Patent Examiner, GAU 2128
Structural Design, Modeling, Simulation and Emulation

**KAMINI SHAH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**